

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/377,447

Applicant(s)

BEZOS ET AL.

Examiner

James Zurita

Art Unit

2165

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) James Zurita. (3) _____.

(2) Ron Schoenbaum. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: _____.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: <http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/subst/community/community.html/> - web site.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 12, 26, 32, new claim 37.

Identification of prior art discussed: Linden US Patent 6,266,649.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

James Zurita

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

This is a list of items that we discussed in our phone interview. Please verify for accuracy.

three overall distinctions between application and reference cited:

a -Linden does not disclose determination of what items are popular within specific user communities that represent sub-sets of a general user population.

b -Linden does not disclose determining the popularity of an item within a community relative to the item's popularity in a general user population.

c- Linden does not disclose identifying items that are popular within implicit membership communities.

d - [discussed possibility of removing redundant word "community" in claim 32].

see attached Email